



**MEADOW OF THE OBSERVER  
IN  
EXPOSITION OF ABOO NAASIR'S IGNORANCE**

روضة الناظر  
في  
كشف جهالات أبي ناصر

**By:**

**Ustaadh Abu 'Ubaydah Ayinla**

## بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

All praise is due to Allaah, Lord of all that exists, the good end is for the pious and there should be no enmity except against the rebels.

As for what follows,

I received the “Clarification” written by Aboo Naasir on the matter of الله ما أنزل الله (Ruling with other than what Allah revealed), issues of īmaan and a few other matters, which is sequel to the answer I gave in response to the questions asked concerning the subject (Aboo Naasir), and I deem it important to expose some things which remain unclear to Aboo Naasir perhaps, Allah may use it as the cause of his return and those who follow him, from the darkness of shirk to the light of Tawhid and Sunnah, if Allah wills.

«وَكَذَٰلِكَ نَفْصَلُ الْآيَاتِ وَلِتَسْتَبِينَ سَبِيلُ الْمُجْرِمِينَ»

And thus do We detail the Aayat, and [thus] the way of the criminals will become evident. [Q6:55]

Firstly, the article/clarification is not knowledge based and lacks what the scholars term “Al-Manhajul-Ilmi”; you don’t refute by bringing counter quotes only, rather you first respond to the opponents’ points and this alone may be enough in some cases and if not, you may bring counter quotes.

You should have responded to the quotations I made either by explaining it otherwise or stating that the Salaf quoted are Khawaarij since they clearly made blanket takfeer on those who rule by manmade laws. Aboo Naasir’s last “clarification” can be summarized under the following headings:

- a. Quotes from Ibnul Qayyim and eight other scholars;
- b. A quote from Ibn Taimiyyah on the case of the Negus;
- c. The issue of Īman and its definition;
- d. He attempted to defend himself on some other lesser allegations (Jihad week; Alaroism; INEC).

## **Part A**

### **Quotes from Ibnul Qayyim and eight other scholars**

As for the quote of Ibnul Qayyim, responding to it will serve as response to the eight other quotations brought to buttress it as they all stem from Aboo Naasir's poor grasp of the subject matter.

Aboo Naasir did injustice and displayed lack of intellectual sincerity as he did not mention the context in which Ibnul Qayyim used the term "Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh" and also, he didn't quote the next two lines which marks the end of the chapter as that would have revealed the underlying context of Ibnul Qayyim's words which Aboo Naasir would not like his readers to know.

Ibnul Qayyim was talking about sins generally and the need for repentance and he said (immediately after the quotation brought by Aboo Naasir):

"And what is intended: is that all sins are part of the lesser Kufr as it is opposite of Shukr, which is to perform acts of obedience. Therefore, actions are either Shukr or Kufr or a third category, which is neither part of the former nor later. And Allah knows best." [End quote from Madaariju Saalikeen 1/345 by Ibnul Qayyim]

From the above, it becomes clear that Ibnul Qayyim was discussing sins generally which are lesser than Kufr and this is what the Salaf sometimes refer to as “Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh” and this form of Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh is never Kufr in itself rather it will depend on the status of the Haakim (i.e the sinner, as technically used here and not ‘the ruler’ as translated by Aboo Naasir or where he copied it) just like Zina, Alcohol, stealing etc. are not Kufr in itself but depends on the situation of the sinner which might make him a Kaafir in some instances.

A quick pointer to this is that there is another edition of Madaariju Saalikeen with the tahqeeq of Abdul-Azeez Al-Jaleel, in the footnote, the commentator said:

ويبقى نوع آخر من الحكم بغير ما أنزل الله يندرج تحت الكفر الأكبر المخرج من الملة وهو ما حدث في هذه الأزمنة المتأخرة من التبديل لشرع الله عز وجل...

Meaning: There remains another type of “Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh” which falls under Kufr Akbar that takes one out of the fold of Islam and that is what happens in this later times of changing the law of Allah the Almighty ... [End quote from Madaariju Saalikeen 1/589 by Ibnul Qayyim tahqeeq of Abdul-Azeez Al-Jaleel ed. 1423H]

From the above, we see that the *Muhaqiq* did not fault Ibnul Qayyim and likewise he didn't say ruling by manmade law is not Kufr Akbar but he mentioned the details and hinted at the context in which Ibnul Qayyim used the term “Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh”, and for those who care, check the footnote, it is a lengthy one as he brought other clear cut statements of Ibnul Qayyim and his teacher Ibn Taimiyyah (may Allah have mercy on both) explaining the type of “Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh” that is Kufr Akbar always.

This is the type of verification Aboo Naasir cannot do, either due to unwillingness or incapability; whenever he comes across the statement of a scholar of Sunnah saying

“Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh” is not Kufr Akbar in itself, he becomes happy, that is ignorance and injustice just as being practiced by the Sufis and Ikhwanis; when a Sufi comes across a scholarly statement saying shaving the beards is Makruh, he becomes happy oblivious of the context and not knowing that the Salaf used the term Makruuh for numerous rulings, same way when an Ikhwani comes across a Salaf saying “Ijtimaa’ on Dhikr” is Sunnah, he clings to it oblivious of the context and the meaning of the term to the Salaf.

The same thing applies to Aboo Naasir, he is not aware that “Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh” has different meanings to the Salaf and in most cases when the term is used, it means sins and not the use of manmade law as explained above.

As a point of benefit, the Salaf use the term “Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh” to refer to six different things, which are:

1. Sins;
2. Collection of bribe in judgment/intentionally giving a wrong judgment due to personal benefit;
3. Following/enforcing manmade law;
4. Legislating manmade law;
5. Claiming the absolute right of legislation;
6. Fighting against the Shar’eeah of Allah.

Listed in accordance with severity, the first two are not Kufr in itself and depend on the condition of the hakim (the sinner/culprit) and this answers the doubts raised from all quotations by Aboo Naasir saying “Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh” is lesser Kufr or depends on the situation of the sinner, the Salaf quoted referred to the types of “Hukm bi ghayri ma anzala lloh” not originally Kufr in itself.

For more benefits, I refer the reader and Aboo Naasir to

- a) The footnotes of the second edition of Madaariju Saalikeen quoted above and
- b) The Sharh of Nawaaqidul Islam by Al-Imam Turki Al-Ben’ali page 52-66.

Another point of benefit is that Al-Imam Ibn Katheer who brought the narration of Kufr duna Kufr in the tafseer of Suratul-Ma’idah ayah 44 is the same person who in the tafseer of ayah 50 said:

ومن فعل ذلك منهم فهو كافر يجب قتاله حتى يرجع إلى حكم الله ورسوله فلا يحكم سواه في قليل ولا كثير.

Meaning: And whoever does that amongst them (i.e. rules with manmade law) he is a Kaafir whom it is obligatory to fight against until he returns to the rule of Allah and His Messenger (peace and blessings be upon him) and he does not rule with other than it in the small and big (matters). [End quote from Tafsir Ibn Katheer]

In addition, in Al-Bidaayah wa Nihaayah, he narrated the Ijma of the Muslims on this issue.

Dear reader, is it not an injustice, after this clear statement from Ibn Katheer to now ascribe to him that he does not make takfeer of those who rule by manmade law all because in the previous ayah (44), he brought the narration of Kufr duna Kufr? Is it not clear to the sane mind now that to him (Ibn Katheer) and others, “Hukm bi ghayri ma

anzala lloh” technically refers to something different?

فإنها لا تعمي الأبصار ولكن تعمي القلوب التي في الصدور (سورة الحج 46)

((For indeed, it is not eyes that are blinded, but blinded are the hearts, which are within the breasts.)) [22:46]

## **Part B**

### **On the issue of An-Najaashi (the Negus)**

Aboo Naasir also did an intellectual fraud by quoting Ibn Taimiyyah out of context, and this shall be refuted from three angles:

1. Out of context quotation;
  2. There is no evidence that the Negus implemented manmade law rather he followed the laws of the Injeel and was therefore part of the people of the book categorised as Muslims in the Qur'an (as proven from the same source);
  3. The Negus' case - according to Ibn Taimiyyah - was just like a civil servant or Imam in a non Muslim country.
- 
1. I will bring a more comprehensive quotation from the source so as to proof that Ibn Taimiyyah was not talking about ruling by manmade law, he was talking about a different topic entirely which is the situation of the one not capable of practicing his religion openly:

In the beginning of the chapter in Minhaaju Sunnah 5/111, Ibn Taimiyyah said:

وكذلك الكفار من بلغته دعوة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في دار الكفر، وعلم أنه رسول الله فأمن به، وآمن بما أنزل عليه، واتقى الله ما استطاع، كما فعل النجاشي وغيره ولم يمكنه الهجرة إلى دار الإسلام، ولا التزام جميع شرائع الإسلام، لكونه ممنوعاً من الهجرة وممنوعاً من إظهار دينه وليس عنده من يعلمه جميع شرائع الإسلام – فهذا مؤمن من أهل الجنة، كما كان مؤمن آل فرعون مع قوم فرعون .. ص. 111

“And likewise the Kuffaar, whom the Da’wah of the Prophet ﷺ reached in the land of Kufr, [among them are those] who knew he is the Messenger of Allah and believed in him and in what was revealed to him, and feared Allah as much as they could, just like the Negus did and some others; he was not able to make Hijrah and to adhere to all the rulings of the Sharee’ah, because he was banned from making Hijrah and also banned from practicing his religion openly, and there was no one with him to teach him all the Sharee’ah. Hence, a person like this is from the believers, the inhabitants of al-Jannah, just like the believing man from the tribe of Fir’awn.” Pg. 111

And finally on page 122 -125 (end of chapter), he said:

وبالجملة لا خلاف بين المسلمين أن من كان في دار الكفر وقد آمن وهو عاجز عن الهجرة لا يجب عليه من الشرائع ما يعجز عنها بل الوجوب بحسب الإمكان ... وهذا يطابق الأصل الذي عليه السلف والجمهور: أن الله تعالى لا يكلف نفساً إلا وسعها. فالوجوب مشروط بالقدرة، والعقوبة لا تكون إلا على ترك مأمور أو فعل محظور بعد قيام الحجة. [ص 125 نهاية الفصل]

“Generally, there is no disagreement among the Muslims that whoever is in the land of Kufr and has believed while incapable of making Hijrah, that some aspects of the Sharee’ah, which he finds impossible to practice, are not obligatory on him rather, obligations are with respect to capability... This is identical to the principle that the Salaf and the Majority were upon; that Allah does not charge a soul except with that within its capacity. Obligations are conditional on ability, and punishment is only for leaving what is enjoined or doing what is prohibited after the evidence has shown.” End quote, pg. 125

From the above, it becomes clear that the case of the Negus was that of a person under duress and could not even announce he had become Muslim, just like the case of the man



among Pharaoh's tribe. It is not the same with a ruler who has power and an army and is capable of doing what he wills but rather than practicing Islam, he wages war against the Muslims, such is not considered under duress. If not to avoid lengthening the response, I would narrate from the same source how Ibn Taimiyyah differentiated between the two cases using the story of Abbass, uncle of the prophet (may Allah have mercy on him).

2. The second angle, is that there is no single piece of evidence neither from the Qur'an nor Sunnah to accuse the Negus of implementing other than the law of Allah, he might not have ruled by the law of Allah, but definitely no evidence says he ruled by other than the law of Allah and there is a big difference between the two. Ibn Taimiyyah (may Allah have mercy on him) was also careful not to accuse the Negus of ruling by other than the Qur'an rather, he said:

“And we know for certain that it was not possible for him to rule them with the law of the Qur'an”

And elsewhere he said:

“And the Negus, it was not possible for him to rule by the Qur'an.”

Notice the choice of words!

And why was it not possible?

He knew little or nothing of the Sharee'ah other than the testimony of faith; nobody to assist him in ruling as nobody knew Islam and setting up an Islamic government is not a one man task; he was powerless as he was just a ceremonial king; the Sharee'ah was not completed even when he died eight years after Hijrah (the longest date narrated); and many other excuses.

3. The Negus' case (according to Ibn Taimiyyah) was just like a civil servant or Imam in a non-Muslim country.

In Minhaaju Sunnah 5/113, he said:

...وكثيرا ما يتولى الرجل بين المسلمين والترتار قاضيا – بل وإماما – وفي نفسه أمور من العدل يريد أن يعمل بها، فلا يمكنه ذلك، بل هناك من يمنعه ذلك ولا يكلف الله نفسا إلا وسعها ... ص113

“Often would a man assume the position of a judge amongst the Muslims and the Tatars or even as an Imaam - and in his heart are things of justice he would want to act with, but not able to do so rather, there were those who prevent him from doing so, and Allah does not charge a soul except with that within its capacity.” Pg. 113

So who in his right senses would blame a single civil servant or a mosque Imam for not ruling by the Sharee'ah? Of course, no! Nobody does that since such a person is not capable of such, rather ruling by the Sharee'ah (which means government) is not an obligation on such a person. The form of “Hukmu bi ma anzala llohu” that is obligatory on such a person is to follow the personal Sharee'ah rulings as much as possible as stated by Ibn Taimiyyah on page 125 quoted above.

On the other side, by using the story of the Negus and the narration of Ibn Abbās to rule that ruling with manmade laws is not a major Kufr, Aboo Naasir displayed stark ignorance in Usul-ul-Fiqh, and thereby followed the methodology of the people of deviation in deducing legal rulings.

This point is evident in the fact that evidences that are particular to each issue are in need of the universal evidences, they do not serve as evidence for general ruling. In the next few paragraphs, I will give an instance to make it clear.

This is the prohibition of Isbaal. The people of Sunnah hold that Isbaal is haram however, the people of bid'ah, most especially the contemporary Sufis and the filthy Ikhwanis

disagree with this fact. They leave the universal evidences prohibiting Isbaal and instead use the Hadith of Aboo Bakr - to whom the Messenger ﷺ said,

إِنَّكَ لَسْتَ مِمَّنْ يَصْنَعُ ذَلِكَ خِيَلًا

“You are not one of those who do that out of pride.” [Reported by an-Nasaa’i] - as basis for general ruling on Isbaal hence, saying it is not haram. Thus, they give the cases of individuals (قضايا الأعيان) preference over the universal evidences available.

In a nutshell, using evidences which are particular to some individuals as universal evidences in issues is the way of the people of bid’ah and it is from following the Mutashābihāt (ambiguities) which usually have various interpretations and possibilities. Allah’s Messenger (ﷺ) said,

فَإِذَا رَأَيْتَ الَّذِينَ يَتَّبِعُونَ مَا تَشَابَهَ مِنْهُ، فَأُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ سَمَّى اللَّهُ، فَاحْذَرُوهُمْ.

“If you see those who follow thereof that which is not entirely clear, then they are those whom Allah has named [as having deviation], so beware of them.”

## Part C

### The issue of Īman and its definition

Aboo Naasir also exhibited intellectual fraud by providing the correct definition of Īman and stating a few things about it which might suggest to the naive that he is innocent of the allegation. However, the scrupulous reader would decipher that Aboo Naasir failed in that aspect as well, and that the definition of Īman is not the bone of contention.

He should have addressed the actual issue, which is when one complete aspect/axis of Īman is missing, would the person become a Kaafir or not. Instead of addressing this issue, Aboo Naasir kept emphasizing on the definition of Īman as if I faulted him with regard to the definition.

أقام أياماً يُعَمِّلُ رويته \*\*\* ففَسَّرَ الماء بعد الجُهدِ بالماء

*He stayed for many days exercising his intellect;*

*After great efforts, he explained that water is water [End of poetry].*

## **Part D**

### **(Jihaad Week and all sub issues)**

As for the issue of Jihaad Week, it is good that Aboo Naasir tactically withdrew his statement, he should do the same on the issue of INEC.

Aboo Naasir's "clarification" suggests that asking to know the ruling on INEC is a question that is uncalled for however, that emphasized his hypocrisy and poor grasp of the subject of discourse because, there are various negative positions on the issue even without counting the opinion of whoever says it is permissible; it is not just a professional physical yes or no question. Hence, he should not leave the question open ended; he should state whether it is Haram, Kufr or Makruuh. Leaving the question open ended is a cunning style of the Munaafiquun.

Concerning the ascription, "Alarowiyyah", it is not an ascription to any personality. The term "Alarowiyyu/Alaroist" is from the word "Alarowiyyah" whose origin is from the Yoruba word, "Aro (i.e. Dye)". However, Alarowiyyu is anybody who dilutes the religion of Allah with falsehood regardless of the person's ethnicity, certificate or political affiliation.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, I advise the fair and sincere reader not to be deluded by the words of the likes of Aboo Naasir; they are callers to Jahannam, whoever responds to their call, they throw him into it. The issue of ruling by fabricated constitutions is from the clear-cut matters, which is shirk akbar by the consensus of the Muslims. In fact, the Salafus-Saalih unanimously agreed that those who follow man-made laws are idol worshippers, not until

what we hear in this present time that it is so and so and some conditions are required, Allah's aid is sought.

To round off, I leave the reader with the statement of a great scholar, a pious Salaf, - as we found him to be, but to Allah is his account - Muhammad al-Ameen Ash-Shinqiiti, who said in Adwaa'ul Bayaan:

“And with these heavenly texts we have mentioned, it becomes quiet clear that the ones who follow fabricated laws, which the Shaytan has legislated upon the tongues of his Awliya and which oppose that which Allah has legislated upon the tongues of His messengers, peace be upon them, that no one doubts their Kufr and their Shirk except him whom Allah has removed his sight and has blinded them to the light of the revelation as they are.” [Adwaa'ul-Bayaan 3/439]

Is Aboo Naasir blind?

وصلی اللہ وبارک علی محمد وآلہ وصحبہ وسلم

Ustaadh Abu 'Ubaidah Ayinla

12/06/2020